United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/27/GBR/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 February 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-seventh session
1–12 May 2017

Summary of other stakeholders' submissions United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 56 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints. Where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles.

II. Information provided by the national human rights institution accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

2. Scottish Human Rights Commission (SHRC) recommended that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ratifies and incorporates all human rights treaties without reservation, including individual communications procedures.[2] Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) recommended that the State and devolved governments enhance the status of ratified human rights conventions in domestic law.[3]

3. Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission (NIHRC) was concerned at the Northern Ireland Executive's lack of engagement with treaty bodies on a number of occasions.[4]

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

4. SHRC reported there were a number of outstanding judgements of the European Court of Human rights (ECtHR) with unacceptable delays in implementation.[5]

5. EHRC recommended the establishment of a State national action plan on human rights, including concrete actions to implement United Nations recommendations[6], and NIHRC recommended that this plan focuses on the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.[7]

6. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendation 110.32[8], SHRC stated any reduction in the current legal protections of human rights would potentially undermine the Government's accountability for human rights.[9] SHRC recommended that the State retains the Human Rights Act 1998.[10]

7. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendations on non-discrimination[11], NIHRC recommended that the current equality provisions be simplified, harmonised and strengthened.[12] EHRC recommended that the State and devolved governments work together to adopt a Great Britain-wide Gypsy, Traveller and Roma integration strategy.[13]

8. EHRC indicated that race remained the most commonly recorded motivation for hate crime, and that following the EU Referendum, there was a 57% increase in online reports of hate crime in England and Wales.[14]

9. EHRC recommended that the Government ensures the new privacy and surveillance framework improves protection of privacy rights through clearly defined and limited powers and improved oversight and accountability measures.[15]

10. SHRC expressed concern about detained prison population while awaiting trial and overcrowding in prisons.[16]

11. EHRC highlighted the narrowing of the scope of civil legal aid in England and Wales, and stated changes in court fees in England and Wales and tribunal fees in Great Britain could negatively affect access to justice.[17]

12. Regarding transitional justice, NIHRC recommended that impartial, prompt and effective investigations be conducted into all conflict related deaths in Northern Ireland with a view to identifying, prosecuting and punishing perpetrators of human rights violations and abuses.[18]

13. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendations on combatting trafficking[19], SHRC stated that despite legislative and policy measures to address trafficking of human beings, very few suspected traffickers had been prosecuted.[20]

14. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendations on tackling poverty and reducing inequality[21], SHRC stated that the impact of austerity measures in the form of cuts and changes to eligibility criteria for social security payments had disproportionately impacted vulnerable groups.[22] SHRC also highlighted that inequalities persisted in the extent to which people could enjoy equal access to work and fair conditions of work.[23]

15. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendation on lifting reservations to treaties[24], NIHRC expressed concern that the continuing reservations to International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights meant that the rights contained in it continued to be regarded as largely non-justiciable.[25]

16. EHRC considered violence against women and girls to be one of the most pervasive human rights issues in the country and recommended that the Government ratify the Istanbul Convention.[26]

17. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendations on gender equality[27] SHRC underscored that there was significant gender segregation in relation to employment in Scotland, and mentioned barriers to private and political participation of women.[28]

18. Regarding a 2012-UPR recommendation on child poverty[29] EHRC recommended that the State establishes clear accountability mechanisms for eradicating it.[30]

19. Regarding relevant 2012-UPR recommendations[31] NICCY considered that the State and the devolved governments should immediately prohibit all corporal punishment in the family and in all other institutions and forms of alternative care.[32]

20. NIHRC and SHRC recommended increasing the age of criminal responsibility.[33]

21. EHRC recommended that the State remove its interpretative declaration to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, as children under 18 should not take direct part in hostilities in any circumstances.[34]

22. EHRC recommended that the Government use immigration detention as a last resort, cease detention of vulnerable persons, including children, and set a statutory time limit of 28 days for immigration detention.[35]

III. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[36] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[37]

23. Center for Global Nonkilling (CGNK) deplored that supported 2012-UPR recommendations for the ratification of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance had not been implemented.[38]

24. United Nations Association – UK (UNA-UK) reported the little progress on 2012 UPR recommendation to ratify International Convention on the protection of the Rights of All migrant Workers and Members of their Families, as part of a general reluctance to subscribe to multilateral obligations on migrants.[39]

25. Joint Statement 11 (JS10) reported the State had only ratified two optional protocols enabling individual petitions and reservations remained, therefore not fully meeting a number of 2012-UPR recommendations.[40]

26. JS13 recommended that the State ratifies and implements ILO Convention 189 on Decent Work for Domestic Workers.[41]

27. Council of Europe (CoE) reported that the CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights had warned about the possible negative consequences for the State's interests, international reputation and influence on human rights related matters in case the country withdrew from the European Convention on Human Rights.[42] Friends of the Earth (FOE) indicated that the 2012-UPR recommendation to comply with the rulings of the ECtHR[43] was under threat, as the Government's 2015 election manifesto included a commitment to 'curtail' the role of this Court.[44]

28. JS 9 asserted that the State's reaction to the Working Group on Arbitrary detentions on the case of Mr. Julian Assange raised serious concern about its commitment to the international rule of law, and its refusal to comply with the decision of the Working Group and disrespectful statements undermined respect for UN human rights mechanisms.[45]

29. JS1 reported on consistent failures in the State's approach to reporting on human rights, particularly with regard to devolved regions, and recommended ensuring that all regions, particularly the devolved governments, participate fully in human rights monitoring mechanisms.[46]

B. National human rights framework[47]

30. FOE stated 2012-UPR accepted recommendation on ensuring integration of human rights principles in domestic laws[48] was under threat, as the Government's stated intention to replace the Human Rights Act with a British Bill of Rights was liable to erode human rights.[49] JS1, JS11 and UNICEF-UK considered this recommendation was at risk[50], and JS10 expressed concern that vulnerable groups would be left without protection if the Human Rights Act was repealed or weakened.[51] NICCY stated any new British Bill of Rights should build upon, rather than reduce, the protection of the rights of children and provide effective judicial remedies.[52]

31. Age-UK underscored that any future human rights legislation should not undermine the effectiveness or scope of the Human Rights Act or the potential for enforcing it.[53]

32. René Cassin-UK (RC-UK) believed that proposed changes to repeal the Human Rights Act undermined the country's international moral authority and weakened its commitments to international obligations.[54] JS11 recommended that the State retain this Act.[55]

33. JS9 highlighted the importance of ratifying UN individual complaint mechanisms to address the void which would be created by *Brexit*.[56] JS3 recommended ensuring that the realisation of rights enjoyed through various European Union instruments will not be negatively impacted.[57]

34. JS3 recommended that the State expedite the enactment of a strong and inclusive Bill of Rights for Northern Ireland which is based on international human rights standards without delay.[58]

35. UNA-UK recommended that the State ensures that the provisions of all ratified human rights instruments are incorporated into domestic law, and that it retains human rights as a priority in its foreign policy.[59]

36. JS3 expressed disappointment about the lack of plans to establish a national human rights action plan to coordinate the implementation of international human rights standards[60], and JS1 recommended ensuring mainstreaming of human rights in government budgets and programmes, including in the devolved administrations.[61] The Children and Young People's Commissioner Scotland (CYPCS) reported insufficient government engagement and accountability on the promotion and delivery of the 2012-UPR recommendations.[62] CYPCS recommended the establishment of an institutional framework at a United Kingdom and Scottish level to oversee the delivery of a national action plan on monitoring the implementation of the UPR recommendations.[63]

37. JS3 recommended ensuring that all regions of the State, particularly the devolved governments, consult fully with civil society in preparation for the UPR and other UN mechanisms.[64]

38. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendations on the independence of the national human rights institutions[65], JS10 asserted that the independence of the Equality and Human Rights Commission was at risk, as further cuts to its staff were reported.[66] JS11 stated that, whilst the powers of the Children's Commissioner for Scotland had been extended to cover investigations concerning individual children, concerns remained over funding.[67] Regarding 2012-UPR recommendation 110.36[68], Northern Ireland Commissioner for Children and Young People (NICCY) referred to Children's Commissioners in England, Wales and Northern Ireland being sponsored by government departments rather than being directly accountable to the legislatures.[69]

39. Regarding relevant 2012-UPR recommendations[70], NICCY indicated that the State and devolved governments should fully incorporate the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its Protocols into their legislation.[71]

40. Referring to relevant 2012-UPR recommendations[72], AI reported that the State continued to take a narrow view of the extraterritorial application of international and regional human rights treaties, thereby undermining human rights protection.[73]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[74]

41. JS11 stated that little progress was made on 2012-UPR recommendation to eliminate discrimination[75], underscoring minority ethnic people were over-represented in the criminal justice system.[76]

42. JS10 reported that 2012-UPR recommendations on measures to combat prejudices, address hate crimes and xenophobia were not fully met[77], as race was the most commonly recorded motivation for hate crime in England and Wales, and recent data showed a post-*Brexit* 42% increase in hate crime.[78] CoE reported that in 2012 the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance recommended inter alia, that authorities consider how to best ensure that legal aid was available in discrimination cases before employment tribunals.[79]

43. Rene Cassin-UK (RC-UK) urged the Government to prioritise addressing inequalities experienced by ethnic minority communities when considering new policies in combating discrimination.[80]

44. JS1 underscored the impact of the lack of suitable accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Roma, particularly on education and health, and expressed the State was not doing enough to follow related 2012-UPR recommendations.[81]

45. The young transgender centre of excellence (YTCE) referred to discrimination experienced by transgender people as a result of their gender identity, and recommended inter alia, that staff of public bodies receive relevant mandatory training.[82] JS14 called for a new approach to social security in order to protect and support people living with HIV in Scotland.[83]

46. British Humanist Association (BHA) stated that in Northern Ireland, same-sex marriages were not legal[84], and AI recommended that the Government end discrimination against these couples.[85]

47. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendation on discrimination in education[86], National Secular Society (NSS) recommended, inter alia that the State eliminate religious selection in admissions procedures to publicly-funded schools.[87]

48. Age-UK recommended, inter alia, that an immediate and significant injection of funding into social care be carried out in order to safeguard older people's human rights.[88]

Right to development[89]

49. JS15 considered that the State had met its recommendation to continue its financial commitment to international development.[90] JS15 expressed concern, however about the State using overseas development assistance to support the growth of private education in

recipient countries, as it could undermine the right to education by, inter alia, increasing segregation and discrimination.[91]

Environmental issues[92]

50. Friends of the Earth-FOE claimed immediate steps to address climate change, and recommended that the Government enact legislation to ensure accountability for human rights abuses and environmental damage resulting from global operations of United Kingdom companies.[93]

51. FOE recommended that the Government take immediate effective action to reduce air pollution and addresses underlying socio-economic and racial inequalities.[94]

Human rights and counter-terrorism[95]

52. AI pointed out that the State maintained counter-terrorism legislation and policy that failed to comply with the highest human rights standards.[96] JS11 indicated that no progress had been made regarding 2012-UPR recommendations on protecting human rights while combating terrorism.[97]

53. JS16 asserted that proposed surveillance legislation failed to comply with international standards and called the State to uphold the commitments made during the last UPR.[98]

54. JS10 stated there were concerns about the Government's Investigatory Powers Bill, which would expand the data-gathering powers of security services, police and public bodies.[99] JS16 reported this Bill remained vague and did not establish that surveillance powers should be independently authorised, for example, by a judge.[100]

55. JS16 recommended, inter alia, that the Government uphold commitments made during the last UPR session[101] halting the process of the Investigatory Powers Bill, and desisting from bulk surveillance and bulk communications interference, which are inherently disproportionate with human rights to privacy and freedom of expression.[102]

56. JS16 stated that the Counter Extremism and Safeguarding Bill would introduce new powers that could pose serious challenges to freedom of expression in particular for persons belonging to minority religions or those with dissenting views.[103]

57. AI recommended that the State ensures all current and future counter-terrorism measures are fully compatible with international human rights law and standards.[104] Right Watch-UK (RW-UK) recommended that any measures introduced to counter extremism be subject to public consultation.[105]

2. Civil and Political Rights

Right to life, liberty and security of the person[106]

58. CGNK commended the State's support towards abolishing the death penalty worldwide and encouraged it to enhance the respect for the right to life in its constitution and to progressively and duly limit arms transfer.[107]

59. The Howard League (THL) asserted that the number of people serving indeterminate sentences had increased.[108] Child Rights International Network (CRIN) recommended that the State enact and enforce legislation prohibiting all forms of life imprisonment for any offence committed while under the age of 18.[109] THL stated that England and Whales were one of the few jurisdictions in Europe to sentence children to life sentences.[110]

60. JS10 believed that recommendations 110.94 and 110.96 were partially met, as the overall number of children in custody had reduced but that the use of restraint had doubled

over last five years.[111] THL reported about ongoing degrading treatment of children in penal detention and pointed out that opportunities for children to challenge this treatment and seek redress had been severely curtailed since legal aid cuts in 2013.[112]

61. JS10 referred to concerns such as prison overcrowding in England and Wales, serious assaults, deaths in prisons and segregation.[113] The Committee for the Prevention of Torture of the Council of Europe referred to prison overcrowding in Scotland, and recommended promoting alternatives to imprisonment.[114] JS9 referred to concerns about England and Wales' average length of pre-trial detention.[115]

62. ACAT-UK recommended that the State carry out an independent investigation into allegations of torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment by British soldiers abroad and prosecute and condemn the authors of such acts.[116]

63. Regarding a specific 2012-UPR recommendation[117], RW-UK indicated that the Government established an inquiry on arbitrary detention regarding the State's implication in a program of secret detention, which had fallen far short of satisfying the Government's human rights obligations of holding an independent and effective inquiry.[118]

64. RW-UK asserted that the Investigatory Powers Tribunal lacked a number of due process and procedural guarantees, and the Parliamentary body tasked with overseeing the conduct of security agencies was heavily controlled by the Executive.[119] It recommended that the State take action to improve the independence and transparency of current national security oversight mechanisms.[120]

65. On 2012-UPR recommendation 110.77[121], BHA asserted that abortion was criminalised across the State,[122] while AI considered no progress was met on this recommendation, calling the Government to ensure that the law on access to abortion in Northern Ireland fully complies with international human rights law by decriminalizing abortion and ensuring access to abortion in cases of severe and fatal foetal anomalies and where the pregnancy is a result of rape or incest.[123]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[124]

66. AI stated that the expansion of "closed material procedures" to ordinary civil courts was contrary to the State's commitment during its previous review to ensure secret evidence was limited only to cases of immediate threat to public security.[125] AI recommended that the State repeals this expansion and ensures that material pertaining to human rights violations is disclosed where relevant to proceedings.[126]

67. Law Society of England and Wales asserted that a combination of legal aid cuts and exponential increases in court fees had served to increase the hurdles faced by citizens trying to defend their legal rights[127], and JS1 underscored its impact on the most disadvantaged groups.[128]

68. FOE asserted that litigation to protect environment was very expensive, and recommended that the Government remove procedural and cost barriers for claimants to ensure equal access to justice.[129]

69. AI expressed concern that there had not yet been any concrete movement to create a human rights compliant mechanism for investigating and remedying past human rights violations and abuses that occurred during decades of political violence in Northern Ireland.[130]

70. AI recommended that United Kingdom immediately transfers the inquiry into allegations of the State's involvement in abuse of detainees held overseas, from the Parliamentary Intelligence and Security Committee to an independent judicial body.[131]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political[132]

71. Campaign for Freedom of Information in Scotland (CFOIS) stated that the right to access information had become progressively weakened with a negative impact on transparency and accountability.[133]

72. Reporters Without Borders (RSF-RWB) expressed concern about the Investigatory Powers Bill, intended to replace the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, as it would allow the police and intelligence agencies to intercept, gather and store communications without giving prior notice.[134] RWUK recommended that the State introduce safeguards to protect the confidentiality of journalistic material, and freedom of speech.[135]

73. JS16 recommended that the State ensures the continuing editorial independence and autonomy of the public service broadcasters under the new BBC Charter.[136] JS16 recommended that the State bring criminal communications legislation which remained vague into line with human rights standards, by limiting their scope and addressing their lack of clarity.[137]

74. FOE indicated that Peaceful environmental protestors had been criminalised in particular through the use of public order offences and recommended ensuring civil society's right to expression and association, including by reviewing policing of environmental protests.[138] JS16 stated that the practice of monitoring and logging protesters' conduct stigmatised them and chilled the exercise of assembly and expression rights.[139]

75. JS16 assured that the Lobbying Act restricted freedom to participate in political affairs[140], while JS10 stated it made harder for organizations to achieve their charitable objectives.[141] JS10 criticized the Government proposals to introduce an 'anti-advocacy clause'[142] and FOE reported that if implemented, this clause would prevent charities and others receiving public money from lobbying Government and Parliament.[143] FOE recommended that the Government hold an independent review of the politicisation of the Charity Commission.[144]

76. JS10 considered recommendation 110.48 on complying with rulings of the ECtHR had not been met, as judgments on prisoner voting rights remained outstanding.[145]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[146]

77. JS13 reported legislative improvements including the establishment of the Modern Slavery Act 2015 and the creation of an Anti-Slavery Commissioner, while noting persisting obstacles to protect victims, including the low levels of prosecutions and convictions.[147]

78. JS10 reported that recommendations on trafficking[148] were partially met, but remained at risk, as victims faced difficulty in accessing medical, counseling and legal services.[149] JS13 underscored that migrant domestic workers continued to suffer situations amounting to trafficking and forced labour.[150] JS13 considered that despite the State support to 2012-UPR recommendation on retaining overseas domestic worker visa to safeguard migrant workers from abuses[151], this had not been implemented.[152]

Right to privacy and family life[153]

79. Access Now (AN) asserted that *a priori* data retention requirements enforced by the State infringed upon individual privacy, and chilled the exercise of human rights.[154]

80. European Union Agency for Human Rights (EUFRA) indicated that after the High Court of Justice decided on the incompatibility of the Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act 2014 with the right to private life and protection of personal data, the British

government responded by publishing a draft bill which included the requirement of judicial authorisation for warrants.[155]

81. EUFRA indicated that courts were inaccessible in practice for individuals to obtain adequate redress for unlawful surveillance.[156]

3. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work [157]

82. Scottish Trades Union Centre (STUC) asserted that the pursuit of policies that deregulated the labour market further would ultimately lead to an increase in exploitative contracts and a reduction in the prevalence of decent work.[158]

83. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendations 110.62-110.65[159], Nourish Scotland (NS) underscored that there was a significant gender pay gap, and that the reform of social security had had a disproportionate impact on women, children, and disabled people.[160] JS10 considered these recommendations had not been fully met, highlighting that job segregation and pregnancy-related discrimination also occurred.[161]

84. JS10 expressed serious concern that the Trade Union Act 2016 set statutory thresholds and substantial new legal hurdles[162] and JS16 stated it restricted strike activity and industrial action, undermining freedom of expression and association.[163]

Right to social security[164]

85. JS12 stated the welfare reform had aimed not only to cutting public expenditure but also reducing welfare dependency and incentivising work by freezing and capping social security benefits.[165] NS stated that at the same time as the reforms had dramatically cut and limited eligibility to social security, the Government had reduced the tax burden of the wealthiest earners and businesses.[166]

Right to an adequate standard of living[167]

86. NS considered that financial accessibility to food was the area in which the State had most regressed since the 2012-UPR cycle.[168] On relevant 2012-UPR recommendations,[169] Nourish Scotland (NS) stated that in the absence of a strategic plan for the progression of the right to food, action was disparate and incoherent.[170] JS14 indicated that the State Government was failing to be proactive in eliminating food insecurity.[171]

87. JS10 affirmed that because recent policy and legislative changes had seen a regression in the welfare system's ability to tackle poverty, with a negative impact on vulnerable social groups, four related 2012-UPR recommendations had not been fully met and remained at risk.[172] JS14 highlighted that despite support to these recommendations, the Government had proceeded to continue making wide-ranging reforms to the welfare system.[173] STUC referred to the growth of insecure work, the punitive and degrading nature of the benefit system, wider cuts to public services and increasing housing costs.[174]

88. The Traveller Movement (TTM) reported that despite acceptance of 1012-UPR recommendation on adequate housing and health[175], the lack of sites for gypsies, travellers and Roma had forced them into bricks and mortar accommodation.[176]

89. JS12 recommended that the United Kingdom Government addresses the issue of homelessness in Northern Ireland by, inter alia, ensuring there were fewer barriers to accessing healthcare, social services, employment and education.[177]

Right to health[178]

90. Regarding 2012-UPR recommendation on inter alia, guaranteeing the right to health[179], JS14 called on the Scottish Government o ensure that people living with and at risk of HIV could enjoy their rights on an equal basis with others.[180] JS14 expressed concern that there remained no compulsory requirenent for a programme of sex education in Scotland.[181]

91. CGNK encouraged the State to do more abortion prevention and suicide prevention.[182]

92. JS7 recommended stopping the use of excessive force against people within mental health services.[183] Alzheimer Scotland (AS) recommended that the Government ensure that people with dementia and theirs carers can meanngfully participate in the decisions that affect them.[184] Release underscored the negative impact of drug policies that criminalized people who used drugs.[185]

4 Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[186]

93. JS10 reported that a number of recommendations on violence against women[187] had not been met, and others were at risk of not being met[188], underscoring the lack of sufficient resources for support services.[189] Refugee Rights Data Project (RRDP) considered that the Government had only partially implemented 2012-UPR recommendation 110.29, as the State had signed but not ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Woman and Domestic Violence.[190] EUFRA reported that the State had introduced reforms aimed at extending definitions of sexual violence to include all forms of non-consensual sexual acts.[191]

94. JS10 mentioned legislative developments on forced marriage and female genital mutilation, expressing concerns that the criminalization route could prevent women from reporting harm.[192] Regarding 2012-UPR recommendation 110.69,[193] NSS expressed serious concern at the State's failure to successfully prosecute a single case of female genital mutilation.[194]

Children[195]

95. JS11 asserted that despite strong 2012-UPR recommendations[196], 3.9 million children were living in poverty in the country in 2014-2015 and recommended that the State and devolved governments make the elimination of child poverty a national priority.[197]

96. JS11 recommended that the Government expedite bringing domestic legislation in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child at both national and devolved level to ensure its provisions were directly applicable and judiciable.[198] JS11 recommended the United Kingdom Government and devolved governments to each develop a child rights action plan, in consultation with stakeholders.[199]

97. JS11 welcomed developments on the recommendation to fully implement this Convention[200] but indicated that the day to day responsibility for implementing it fell within a small team in the Department for Education, which lacked the necessary capacity and authority.[201]

98. JS10 stated that 2012-UPR recommendations on lowering the age of criminal responsibility remained unmet.[202] JS11 recommended that legislation to increase the mandatory age of criminal responsibility be introduced at the earliest opportunity.[203]

99. JS11 recommended, inter alia, that the State and devolved governments prohibit corporal punishment in the family, considering no progress was made on relevant 2012-UPR recommendations.[204]

100. JS11 recommended that the Declaration on Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict be amended to ensure that child recruits cannot take part in hostilities in any circumstances,[205] indicating that relevant 2012-UPR recommendations were not met[206]. JS11 called on the State Government to raise the minimum age for armed forces recruitment to 18 years.[207]

Persons with disabilities[208]

101. Inclusion London expressed that due to welfare benefit reforms and cuts in social care, disabled people were experiencing a marked regression in their right to an adequate standard of living.[209] It stated that people with disabilities continued to experience attitudinal discrimination and physical and institutional barriers, and that the Equality Act required reasonable adjustments to ensure disabled people were not put at a substantial disadvantage.[210]

Minorities[211]

102. TTM stated that Gypsies, Travellers and Roma people continued to experience some of the highest levels of discrimination and poorest life chances in the country and that 2012-UPR recommendation 110.56 had not been met, as there were widespread and repeated allegations of stop and search powers being used to harass them.[212]

103. National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (NFGLG) referred to racism involving verbal abuse through violent and even fatal physical attacks.[213] TTM considered that 2012-UPR recommendations 110.59 and 110.60 had not been met, as hate crimes against gypsies, travellers and Roma minorities were not challenged or acknowledged in the same way as crimes against other ethnic communities.[214] NFGLG reported on overly racist statements from local and national politicians[215], and considered a clearer strategy was needed to take action against the media or individuals that incited discrimination and racism against minorities.[216]

104. CoE reported that the Committee of Ministers of the CoE recommended taking measures to ensure savings in public expenditure did not have a disproportionately negative impact on ethnic minorities.[217]

105. NFGLG recommended that all schools improve inter-cultural understanding and overcome negative stereotyping against minorities.[218]

106. TTM recommended, inter alia that the Government redraft the National Roma Inclusion Strategy, in consultation with relevant organisations.[219]

107. On recommendations 110.61 regarding discrimination against caste, JS14 underscored that the "untouchability mindset" persisted, and urged the State Government to take immediate action to outlaw caste discrimination in the Equality Act 2010.[220]

Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers [221]

108. TTM explained how the use of hate speech by politicians and media had created a climate in which racism and hate speech was thought acceptable, and reported that following the EU referendum there had been a significant spike in anti-migrant attacks.[222] EUFRA reported that in 2014 the State had not implemented any concrete measure for migrant integration and inclusion targeting the general population.[223]

109. JS10 considered a number of recommendations on the rights of migrants remained unmet and at risk[224] as the State was still the only European country without a time limit on detention.[225] JS10 expressed concern about regressive measures such as the "deport first, appeal later" procedure.[226]

110. JS8 reported domestic law permitted the administrative detention of persons subject to immigration control.[227] JS4 supported recommendations that there should be a time limit of 28 days of immigration detention and that vulnerable people should never be detained.[228] AI recommended the Government to inter alia, introduce periodic, automatic judicial oversight of the continuation of a person's immigration detention.[229] Detention Action-UK recommended that the State develop community-based alternatives to detention.[230]

111. RRDP stated that the State government had not implemented 2012-UPR recommendation on implementing CRC[231], as the best interests of the child were regularly rendered subordinate to immigration concerns.[232] Following up to relevant 2012-UPR recommendations[233], JS11 called the State Government to put an end to detention of asylum seeking and migrant children.[234]

112. RRDP underscored as a positive development the passing into law of the 72-hour time limit on the detention of pregnant women but observed that immigration concerns too often trumped the government's obligation to uphold the rights of refugee women in accordance with its international obligations.[235]

113. JS2 underscored the Government's failure to provide adequate follow-on support for successful asylum-seekers[236] and recommended, inter alia, that asylum support continue until the first mainstream benefits were paid.[237] JS2 recommended, inter alia, that the Government provide a level of statutory support for failed asylum seekers until they either return to their country of origin or receive leave to remain in the country.[238]

114. UNICEF-UK stated that 2012-UPR recommendation 1101.115[239] had not been met, recommending accordingly that the Government end the detention of children for immigration purposes, and make appropriate alternatives available.[240]

Stateless[241]

115. Whilst JS8 commended the autonomous procedure for granting stateless persons leave to remain, important shortcomings persisted, including discriminatory treatment of stateless persons, particularly with respect to absence of appeal rights, free legal assistance, and access to a number of economic and social rights.[242] JS8 recommended, inter alia, that the State recognise "statelessness status" as a protection status similar to "refugee status".[243]

E. Specific regions or territories[244]

116. Minority Group International (MRG) recommended, inter alia, that the Government facilitate and support the Chagossioan's right to return to the islands immediately.[245]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status).

Civil society

Individual submissions:

Acat-UK	Acat-UK;
Accessnow	Access Now;
ADF International	ADF International;

Age UK	Age UK;
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom Of Great Britain And Northern Ireland);
AS	Alzheimer Scotland: Action On Dementia;
BHA	British Humanist Association;
CFOIS	Campaign For Freedom Of Information In Scotland;
CGNK	Center For Global Nonkilling;
CRER	Coalition For Racial Equality And Rights;
CRIN	Child Rights International Network;
CYPCS	Commissioner For Children And Young People, Scotland (United Kingdom Of Great Britain And Northern Ireland);
DA	Detention Action, UK;
ES-UK	Electrosensitivity UK;
FFF	Four Freedoms Forum;
FOE EWNI	Friends Of The Earth (England, Wales And Northern Ireland (Ewni);
GG	The Good Group;
IL	Inclusion London;
Impetus	Brighton And Hove Impetus;
TM	the traveller movement;
Just Fair	Just Fair;
LSEW	The Law Society Of England And Wales;
MRG	Minority Rights Group International;
NFGLG	National Federation Of Gypsy Liaison Groups;
Niccy	Northern Ireland Commissioner For Children and Young People;
Nourish Scotland	Nourish Scotland;
ODVV	The Organization For Defending Victims Of Violence;
OHR	Oceania Human Rights;
Release	Release;
RCUK	René Cassin, UK;
RRDP	Refugee Rights Data Project;
RSF-RWB	Reporters Without Borders;
RWUK	Rights Watch (UK);
SCID	Scottish Campaign Against Irresponsible Drivers;
STUC	Scottish Trades Union Centre;
The Howard League	The Howard League For Penal Reform;
UNA-UK	United Nations Association – UK;
UNICEF-UK	Unicef- United Kingdom;
WAE	We're All Equal;
YTCE	The Young Transgender Centre Of Excellence.
Joint Submissions:	
JS1	Joint Submission 1 Submitted By: Friends, Families And Travellers, Leeds Gate, Community Law Partnership, London Gypsy And Traveller Unit, Traveller Law Reform Project, Gypsy, Traveller And Roma Media, Churches Network For Gypsies, Travellers And Roma, Irish Community Care, David Watkinson, Barrister (Non-Practising), Door Tenant, Garden Court Chambers;
JS2	Joint Submission 2 Submitted By: United For Change Manchester, Vivat International, Edmund Rice International, Asylum Link Merseyside, Gmiau (Greater Manchester Immigration Aid Unit), Manchester City Of Sanctuary, North-West Regional Asylum Activism, Rainbow Haven, Revive;
JS3	Joint Submission 3 Submitted By: Human Rights Consortium;
JS4	Joint Submission 4 Submitted By: Campaign To Close Campsfield (Ccc) And Barbed Wire Britain Network To End Refugee And Migrant Detention City (Country);

JS5	Joint Submission 5 Submitted By: Dalit Solidarity Network Uk And International Dalit Solidarity Network;
JS6	Joint Submission 6 Submitted By: Women Enabled International And Sisters Of Frida;
JS7	Joint Submission 7 Submitted By: Coalition Of Recovery Assistance Dogs And Warwick Research;
JS8	Joint Submission 8 Submitted By: Migrants Resource Centre, University Of Liverpool Law Clinic, European Network On Statelessness And Institute On Statelessness And Inclusion;
JS 9	Joint Submission 10 Submitted By: Center For Constitutional Rights, Eva Joly Institute, National Lawyers Guild, International Association Of Democratic Lawyers, Liberty Victoria, Courage Foundation, Centro De Estudios Legales Y Sociales, (Cels), Derechos Humanos En Accion, Australian Lawyers For Human Rights, Australian Lawyers Alliance, Swedish Professors & Doctors For Human Rights (Swedhr), Digital Rights Watch, Sydney Peace Prize Foundation;
JS10	Joint Submission 11 Submitted By: British Institute Of Human Rights;
JS11	Joint Submission 12 Submitted By: Children's Rights Alliance For England, Together (Scottish Alliance For Children's Rights) And The Wales Uncrc Monitoring Group;
JS12	Joint Submission 13 Submitted By: Edmund Rice International, Westcourt Centre, Belfast, Northern Ireland, Council For The Homelessness, Northern Ireland, Revive, Tree Of Life, Wythenshawe;
JS13	Joint Submission 14 Submitted By: Anti-Slavery International And Kalayaan;
JS14	Joint Submission 15 Submitted By: Coalition Of Hiv Ngo's Uk;
JS15	Joint Submission 16 Submitted By: Right To Education Project, Child Rights International Network (Crin), The East African Centre For Human (Eachrights), The Ghana National Education Campaign Coalition, The Global Campaign For Education (Gce), The Global Initiative For Economic, Social And Cultural Rights (Gi-Escr), The Initiative For Social And Economic Rights In Uganda (Iser), The Methare Association, The National Union Of Teachers (Nut), The University And College Union (Ucu);
JS16	Joint Submission 17 Submitted By: Article 19 And English Pen

National Human Rights Institutions:

SHRC	Scottish Human Rights Commission;
EHRC	Equality And Human Rights Commission;
NIHRC	Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE	The Council Of Europe, Strasbourg (France);
EU FRA	European Union Agency For Fundamental Rights;
CoE-CPT	The Committee for the Prevention of Torture of The Council of Europe

[5] SHRC, pp. 2 and 4. See also: NIHRC, p. 1, CYPCS, p. X, and NICCY, p. 2.
[6] EHRC, p. 3.
[7] NIHRC, p. 2. See also: CYPCS, p. 2.
[8] SHRC, p. 2.
[9] EHRC, p. 2.
[10] NIHRC, p. 1. See also: SHRC, p. 3.
[11] Recommendation 110.32 (Qatar). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[12] SHRC, pp. 2 and 3.
[13] SHRC, p. 4.
[14] Recommendations 110.39 (Uzbekistan), 110.43 (Pakistan), 110.49 (Egypt), 110.50 (Indonesia), 110.51 (Cuba), 110.53(China), 110.56 (Austria), 110.57 (Pakistan), 110.58 (Malaysia), 110.66

(Morocco); 110.90 (Malaysia); 110.91 (United States of America); 110.102 (Spain); and 110.108 (Costa Rica). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.

[57] NHRC, p. 3. See also: SHRC, p. 6.

[58] EHRC, p. 6.

[59] EHRC, p. 7. See also: NHRC, p. 6; SHRC, p. 7.

[60] EHRC, p. 14. See also: NHRC, p. 4.

[61] SHRC, p. 7. See also: EHRC, pp. 14 and15.

[62] EHRC, p. 10.

[63] NHRC, p. 3. See also: AI, pp. 6 and 7; CoE, p. 9 and RWUK, pp. 2 and 3.

[64] Recommendation 110.72 (Spain); Recommendation 110.73 (Colombia); Recommendation 110.74 (Australia); Recommendation 110.75 (United States of America); Recommendation 110.76 (Greece). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.

[65] SHRC, p. 8. See also: NHRC, pp. 5 and 6; NICCY, p. 6; EHRC, p. 11 and JS10, p. 10.

[66] Recommendation 110.101(Viet Nam); Recommendation 110.102 (Spain). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.

[67] SHRC, p. 8 See also: NHRC, p. 5. See also: NICCY, p. 7; NHRC, p. 5 and EHRC, p. 5.

[68] SHRC, p. 8. See also: EHRC, p. 19.

[69] Recommendations 110.4 (Belarus) and 110.101(Viet Nam). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.

[70] NHRC, p. 1.

[71] EHRC, p. 9. See also NHRC, p. 5 and SHRC, p. 4.

[72] Recommendation 110.40 (Indonesia); Recommendation 110.52 (Uzbekistan); Recommendation 110.62 (Sudan); Recommendation 110.63 (India); Recommendation 110.64 (Algeria). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.

[73] SHRC, p. 4. See also: EHRC, p. 13.

[74] Recommendation 110.41 (Norway). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.

[75] EHRC, pp. 5 and 6. See also: CYPCS, pp. 5 and 7.

[76] Recommendation 110.78 (Sweden); Recommendation 110.79 (Norway); Recommendation 110.80 (Finland). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.

[77] NICCY, p. 12. *See also*: SHRC, p. 5; CYPCS, p. 5; and NHRC, p. 4.

[78] NHRC, p. 3 and SHRC, p. 6. See also: CYPCS, p. 5.

[79] NHRC, p. 1.

[80] EHRC, p. 10. See also: SHRC, p. 6; and NHRC, p. 3.

[81] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras 110.1-110.6 and 110.8-110.31.

[82] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras 110.46 and 110.47.

[83] CAJ-UK, p. 3. See also: UNA-UK, p. 2. Recommendations 110.22 (Japan), Recommendation 110.23 (Uruguay), Recommendation 110.24 (Argentina), Recommendation 110.25 (Uruguay), and 110.26 (Spain). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.

[84] UNA-UK, p. 2.

[85] JS10, p. 6. See also: UNA-UK, pp. 2 and 7. Recommendation 110.1 (Comoros); Recommendation 110.2 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)); Recommendation 110.3 (Nicaragua); Recommendation 110.4 (Belarus); Recommendation 110.5 (Slovakia); Recommendation 110.6 (Slovenia); Recommendation 110.8 (Russia Federation); Recommendation 110.9 (Slovakia); Recommendation 110.10 (France); Recommendation 110.11 (Algeria); Recommendation 110.12 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)); Recommendation 110.13 (Greece); Recommendation 110.14 (Chile); Recommendation 110.15 (Ecuador); Recommendation 110.16 (Honduras);Recommendation 110.17 (Morocco); Recommendation 110.18 (Egypt, Guatemala, Sudan); (Uruguay, Iran (Islamic Republic of)); Recommendation 110.19 (Uruguay); Recommendation 110.20 (France); Recommendation 110.21(Iraq); Recommendation 110.22 (Japan); Recommendation 110.23 (Uruguay); Recommendation 110.24 (Argentina); Recommendation 110.25 (Uruguay); Recommendation 110.26 (Spain); Recommendation 110.27 (Uruguay); Recommendation 110.28 (Philippines); Recommendation 110.29 (France); Recommendation 110.30 (New Zealand); Recommendation 110.31(Hungary). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.

[86] JS13, p. 11.

[87] CoE, p. 5. See also: AI, pp. 1 and 7; AGJ-UK, pp. 3 and 4; STUC, p. 3; LSEW, p. 2 and JS9, p. 12.

[88] Recommendation 110.48 (Mexico). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.

[45] FOR, p. 3. See also: FIDH, p. 5.
[46] JS9, p. 6. See also: UNA-UK, pp. 2 and 5.
[47] JS1, p. 5. See also: JS3, p. 8.
[48] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 100.82, 100.86, 100.87, 100.88, and 100.90.
[49] Recommendation 110.32 (Qatar). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[50] FOR, p. 3. See also: UNA-UK, pp. 3 and 4, CoE, p. 3, AI, p. 2 and JS9, p. 12.
[51] JS10, p. 5, JS11, P. 3, and UNICEF-UK, p. 3.
[52] JS10, p. 5. See also: RCUK, pp. 2 and 3 and STUC, p. 3.
[53] NICCY, p. 11. See also: EHRC, p. 2.
[54] Age-UK, p. 3. See also: FOR, p. 4, JS16, p. 10, UNA-UK, p. 7, and CYPCS, pp. 3 and 4.
[55] RCUK, pp. 2 and 3. See also: STUC, p. 3.
[56] JS11, p. 3. See also: JS14, p. 9 and AI, p. 7.
[57] JS9, p. 13. See also: FOR, p. 4.
[58] JS3, p. 6.
[59] JS3, pp. 5 and 6. See also: AI, p. 7.
[60] UNA-UK, pp. 4 and 7.
[61] JS3, p. 5.
[62] JS1, p. 6.
[63] CYPCS, p. 1. For the full text of the 2012 UPR recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.
[64] CYPCS, p. 3. See also: JS9, p.2.
[65] JS3, p. 5.
[66] Recommendation 110.36 (Costa Rica); Recommendation 110.37 (Morocco).
[67] JS10, p. 6. See also: Age-UK, p. 3.
[68] JS11, p. 5.
[69] Recommendation 110.36 (Costa Rica). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.
[70] NICCY, p. 3. See also NIHRC, p. 2.
[71] Recommendation 110.39 (Uzbekistan); Recommendation 110.49 (Egypt); Recommendation 110.50 (Indonesia); Recommendation 110.108 (Costa Rica). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.
[72] NICCY, pp. 5 and 11.
[73] Recommendations 110.2 and 110.33 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)); Recommendation 110.3 (Nicaragua); Recommendation 110.118 (Egypt). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.
[74] AI, p. 3.
[75] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.53, 110.59, 110.60, 110.66, 110.90, 110.91 and 110.102.
[76] Recommendation 110.53 (China). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.
[77] JS11, p. 6. See also: CRER, p. 7.
[78] Recommendation 110.59 (Turkey); Recommendation 110.60 (Turkey) Recommendation 110.90 (Malaysia) and Recommendation 110.91 (United States of America). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.
[79] JS10, P. 17. See also: JS1, pp. 5 and 15, and CRER, p. 5.
[80] CoE, p. 5.
[81] RCUK, p. 4. See also: ELFRA, p. 6, CRER, p. 7 and JS1,p. 5.
[82] JS1, pp. 6, 11, 14and 19. See also CoE, p. 5 and CRER, pp. 4 and 5. Recommendation 110.102 (Spain); and Recommendation 110.117 (Hungary). For the full text of the recommendations see A/HRC/21/9.
[83] YSCP, pp. 1, 3 and 6. See also: JS11, p. 8.
[84] JS14, p. 7.
[85] BHA, p. 8.
[86] AI, p. 7.
[87] Recommendation 110.66 (Morocco). For the full text of the recommendation see A/HRC/21/9.
[88] NSS, pp. 2, 3 and 4. See also: BHA, pp. 1- 4.
[89] Age UK, pp. 4 and 6. See also: JS10, p. 23.
[90] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.131.

[90] Recommendation 110.129 (Ireland and Uruguay). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[91] JS15, pp. 2-4. See also: UNICEF-UK, p. 3.
[92] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.68.
[93] FOE, pp. 2, 8 and 9. See also: UNICEF-UK, p. 4; EIN-UK, p. 9 and Victoria Hatton Rights (OHR), P. 2.
[94] FOE, p. 9.
[95] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.50, 110.110, 110.119, 110.120, 110.121, and 110.126.
[96] AI, p. 4. See also: JS11, pp. 6 and 7.
[97] JS11, pp. 6 and 7. Recommendation 110.98 (Malaysia), Recommendation 110.119 (Japan), Recommendation 110.120 (Norway), Recommendation 110.126(Netherlands). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[98] JS16, p.1 See also: AI, p. 1. Recommendation 110.118 (Egypt), Recommendation 110.119 (Japan), Recommendation 110.120 (Norway). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[99] JS10, p. 16. See also: AI, p. 4.
[100] JS16, pp. 1 and 2.
[101] Recommendation 110.118 (Egypt). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[102] JS16, p. 9. See also: AI, p. 7.
[103] JS16, pp. 3 and 10. See also: AI, p. X; JS11, pp. 6 and 7; and JS10, p. 16.
[104] AI, p. 7.
[105] BWUK, pp. 4 and 5. See also: UNA-UK, p. 5.
[106] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.67, 110.68, 110.77, 110.83, 110.84, 110.86, 110.87, 110.94, 110.95, 110.96.
[107] CGNK, pp. 3, 4 and 7. See also: BWUK, p. 3.
[108] TNE, p. 3.
[109] CRIN, p. 4.
[110] TNE, p. 4.
[111] JS10, p. 11.
[112] TNE, p. 3.
[113] JS10, pp. 19-20. See also: TNE, p. 5.
[114] (Press release, Strasbourg 27. 03. 2014, European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, available at http://www.cpt.coe.int/documents/gbr/2014-03-27-eng.htm).
[115] JS9, p. 14.
[116] ACAT, pp. 3 and 4. See also: EHRC, p. 17.
[117] Recommendation 110.84 (Nicaragua). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[118] BWUK, p. 2.
[119] BWUK, p. 1.
[120] BWUK, p. 1.
[121] AI, p. 7. Recommendation 110.77 (Finland). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[122] BHA, p. 10. See also: WAI, pp. 1 and 2; and ADF International, pp. 3 and 6.
[123] AI, p. 8.
[124] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.82.
[125] AI, p. 5. Recommendation 110.83 (Austria). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[126] AI, p. 7.
[127] LME96, pp. 3 and 7. See also: EUFRA, p. 12; and NCEO, pp. 3-4.
[128] JS10, p. 21.
[129] FOE, p. 7.
[130] AI, pp. 6 and 7. See also: CoE, p. 9; BWUK, pp. 2 and 3.
[131] AI, pp. 5 and 7. See also: UNICEF-UK, p. 4.
[132] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.68.
[133] CFoE6, p. 2. See also: EUFRA, p. 15.
[134] ENF-GNB, pp. 1 and 2.

[135] RWUK, p. 5.
[136] JS16, p. 10.
[137] JS16, p. 5.
[138] FOE, pp. 5 and 6.
[139] JS16, pp. 7-10.
[140] JS16, p. 8.
[141] JS10, p. 6. See also: FOE, p. 5.
[142] JS10, p. 6.
[143] FOE, p. 6.
[144] FOE, p. 6.
[145] JS10, p. 5. See also: AI, p. 7.
[146] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.72, 110.73, 110.74, 110.75, 110.76 and 110.109.
[147] JS13, p. 2. See also: RCUK, p. 5, CoE, p. 7 and RRDP, p. 6.
[148] Recommendation 110.73 (Colombia), Recommendation 110.74 (Australia), Recommendation 110.75 (United States of America), Recommendation 110.76 (Greece). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[149] JS10, pp. 19 and 20. See also: UNICEF-UK, p. 6, JS13, p. 2, RCUK, p. 5 and CoE, p. 7.
[150] JS13, p. 2.
[151] Recommendation 110.109 (Thailand). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[152] JS13, pp. 2 and 10.
[153] For relevant recommendations see, A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.98.
[154] AN, p. 2.
[155] EUFRA, p. 7.
[156] EUFRA, p. 15.
[157] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.62, 110.63, 110.64 and 110.65.
[158] STUC, p. 5.
[159] Recommendation 110.62 (Sudan), Recommendation 110.63 (India), Recommendation 110.64 (Algeria) and Recommendation 110.65 (Ukraine). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[160] NS, p. 3. See also: JS10, p. 8.
[161] JS10, p. 8. See also: EUFRA, p. 5.
[162] JS10, p. 7. See also: STUC, p. 8.
[163] JS16, p. 8.
[164] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.42.
[165] JS12, p. 9.
[166] NS, p. 3.
[167] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.41, 110.42, 110.44, 110.101, 110.103, and 110.104.
[168] NS, p. 2.
[169] Recommendation 110.103 (Cuba), Recommendation 110.104 (Spain), Recommendation 110.32 (Qatar), Recommendation 110.26 (Spain). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[170] NS, p. 2.
[171] JS14, p. 7. See also: JS12, p. 10.
[172] JS10, p. 13. See also: STUC, p. 5. Recommendation 110.41 (Norway), Recommendation 110.44 (Nepal), Recommendation 110.101 (Viet Nam), Recommendation 110.103 (Cuba). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[173] JS14, p. 7.
[174] STUC, p. 5. See also: NS, p. 3 and JS10, p. 14.
[175] Recommendation 110.103 (Cuba). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[176] ITMB, pp. 5 and 7. See also: NFGLG, p. 7 and CRER, p. 5.
[177] JS12, pp. 3 and 5. See also: GG, p. 1.
[178] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.103.
[179] Recommendation 110.103 (Cuba). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[180] CHIVNGOsUK, pp. 6 and 8.
[181] JS14, pp. 5 and 6.

[182] CGNK, p. 5.
[183] JS7, p. 4.
[184] AS, p. 6.
[185] Release, pp. 2 and 6.
[186] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras 110.29, 110.69, 110.70, 110.77, 110.88, and 110.99.
[187] Recommendation 110.69 (Brazil), Recommendation 110.70 (Colombia), Recommendation 110.77 (Finland), Recommendation 110.88 (Thailand), Recommendation 110.99 (Slovenia). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[188] Recommendations 110.51 (Cuba), Recommendation 110.71 (Malaysia), Recommendation 110. 40 (Indonesia). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[189] JS10, p. 8. See also: JS6, pp. 1 and 9.
[190] RRDP, p. 5.
[191] EUFRA, p. 13. See also: EUFRA, p. 8.
[192] JS10, P. 8.
[193] Recommendation 110.69 (Brazil). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[194] NSS, p. 7.
[195] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras 110.4, 110.8, 110.41, 110.78, 110.79, 110.80, 110.94, 110.95, 110.101 and 110.106.
[196] Recommendation 110.41(Norway), Recommendation 110.101 (Viet Nam). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[197] JS11, p. 11.
[198] JS11, P. 3. See also: JS10, p. 8 and UNICEF-UK, p. 2.
[199] JS11, p. 5.
[200] Recommendation 110.10 (France). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[201] JS11, p. 4. See also: EUFRA, p. 18.
[202] JS10, p. 10. See also: JS11, pp. 11 and 12.
[203] JS11, pp. 11 and 12. See also: European Committee on Social Rights, Conclusions XX-4 – Article 17, p. 4, available at: http://hudoc.esc.coe.int/; CRIN, p. 4, and NICCY, p. 13.
[204] JS11, pp. 8 and 9. See also: JS11, p. 10 and European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions XX-4, United Kingdom, - Article 17, p. 2, available at: http://hudoc.esc.coe.int. Recommendation 110.78 (Sweden), Recommendation 110.79 (Norway), Recommendation 110.80 (Finland). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[205] JS11, p. 2. See also: UNICEF-UK, p. 2.
[206] Recommendation 110.4 (Belarus), Recommendation 110.8 (Russia Federation). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[207] JS11, p. 15.
[208] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.30 and 110.31.
[209] IL, pp. 8 and 10.
[210] IL, pp. 1 and 6. See also: IL, pp. 3 and 5 and BHI, pp. 3, 6, 7 and 11.
[211] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras. 110.56, 110.59, 110.60 and 110.6.
[212] ITMB, pp. 1 and 3. See also: NFGLG, p. 2 and RWUK, p. 2.
[213] NFGLG, p. 2.
[214] ITMB, p. 9.
[215] NFGLG, p. 2, See also: ITMB, p. 9.
[216] NFGLG, p. 3.
[217] CoE, p. 6.
[218] NFGLG, p. 6.
[219] ITMB, p. 10. See also: NFGLG, p. 2.
[220] JS14, pp. 2 and 3.
[221] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, paras 110.10, 110.108, 110.111, 110.112, 110.113, 110-114 and 110.115.
[222] ITMB, p.9.
[223] EUFRA, p. 9. See also: JS2, p. 6, and European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions XX-4, Article 19-6, 2015, available at: http://hudoc.esc.coe.int.

[224] Recommendation 110.108 (Paraguay), Recommendation 110.110 (Viet Nam), Recommendation 110.111 (Chile), Recommendation 110.112 (Honduras), Recommendation 110.113 (Ecuador), Recommendation 110.114 (Mexico), Recommendation 110.115 (Argentina). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[225] JS10, p. 18. See also: JS8, p. 12.
[226] JS10, P. 18.
[227] JS8, p. 5.
[228] JS4, p. 2. See also: DA-UK, p. 5 and RCUK, p. 4.
[229] AI, pp. 6 and 7. See also: JS4, p. 3 and DA-UK pp. 2 and 3.
[230] DA-UK, pp. 5 and 6.
[231] Recommendation 110.10 (France). For the full text of the recommendation see: A/HRC/21/9.
[232] RRDP, p. 3.
[233] Recommendation 110.113 (Ecuador), Recommendation 110.114 (Mexico), Recommendation 110.115 (Argentina). For the full text of the recommendations see: A/HRC/21/9.
[234] JS11, pp. 14 and 15.
[235] RRDP, p. 5. See also: JS10, P. 18.
[236] JS2, p. 6. See also: EUFRA, p. 5.
[237] JS2, p. 6.
[238] JS2, p. 9.
[239] Recommendation 110.115 (Argentina). For the full text of the recommendation see A/HRC/21/9.
[240] UNICEF-UK, p. 5. See also: CRC/C/GBR/CO/5, paras. 76-77.
[241] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.113.
[242] JS8, pp. 5 and 6.
[243] JS8, p. 15.
[244] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/21/9, para. 110.1.
[245] MRG, p. 6.